

**R E M A R K S**

Claims 1-6 and 8-14 are currently pending in this application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained hereinbelow.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 17, 19 and 20 were identified as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kobayashi*, U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,759 (“*Kobayashi*”) in view of *Starnes* et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,144,996 (“*Starnes*”). (It is believed that this rejection was intended to apply only to claims 1-6 and 8-14 since claims 17-20 were previously canceled.) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 3 of the current Office Action, the Examiner concedes that *Kobayashi* does not disclose the following recited subject matter of the presently claimed invention:

..., wherein the information about the interface client includes at least information about display capabilities of the interface client including at least one of visual display size and visual graphical display characteristics;

....;

determining that the interface client is usable to display the content based at least on the information about the display capabilities of the interface client;

The Examiner then goes on to cite *Starnes* for purportedly disclosing such presently recited subject matter, albeit in the form of “content negotiation” in accordance with the set of rules for exchanging files on the World Wide Web (“WWW”) known as Hypertext Transfer Protocol (“HTTP”). However, even if, arguendo, the practice of such “content negotiation” facilitates client selection of “different languages or different size images” as stated in *Starnes* and cited by the Examiner, and even if, arguendo, “different languages or different size images” constitute “visual graphical display characteristics” provided by the client as asserted by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that there is no evidence or suggestion in either *Kobayashi* or *Starnes* of this combination as set forth by the Examiner. Nor would such a combination have

been reasonably seen as beneficial by one of ordinary skill in the art, given the stark differences between the express goals and subject matter of *Kobayashi* and *Starnes*. The Examiner has not provided any evidence that it was conventional in the art to combine such clearly different references, i.e., the mobile communications device of *Kobayashi* and the network proxy system of *Starnes*. Nor has the Examiner identified, without applying hindsight reconstruction using the presently claimed invention as a template, a credible suggestion to combine the teachings of *Kobayashi* and *Starnes* independent of the references themselves.

The alleged suggestion/motivation proposed by the Examiner is that “content negotiation can provide for improved bandwidth utilization and responsiveness of the Internet”, citing column 2, lines 39-41 of *Starnes*. However, while it may well be that “improved bandwidth utilization and responsiveness of the Internet” are desirable goals for a network proxy system, such goals are tangential at best to the method and system of the presently claimed invention which are “for utilizing an interface client in an interface roaming network for displaying content on the interface client via a wireless device”. In other words, the presently claimed invention is for allowing a wireless device to roam while availing itself of displays of nearby interface clients, thereby benefiting from their larger displays. While maximizing bandwidth utilization and responsiveness of the Internet may be beneficial with respect to the Internet infrastructure in general, any such improvements a la *Starnes* are unlikely to be available or noticeable in the context of the presently claimed invention which will be subject to the signal conditions and bandwidth limitations of its local portion of the wireless network.

Further, notwithstanding the foregoing remarks, reference is hereby made to the remarks in preceding Amendment J, which are incorporated herein by reference, concerning additional differences between the presently claimed invention and the subject matter of *Kobayashi*. It is noted that the claim recitations quoted and cited in Amendment J as being patentably distinguishable over the subject matter of *Kobayashi* were not repeated in the current Office Action as being disclosed by *Kobayashi*, and it is further noted that the Examiner did not rebut those remarks but instead merely declared them moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made and that all rejections have been properly traversed. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections, and it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (312) 609-7620.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 11, 2009

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
(312) 609-7620  
fax: (312) 609-5005

By:   
Mark A. Dalla Valle  
Registration No. 34,147